

First-Order Melting of a Moving Vortex Lattice: Effects of Disorder

Daniel Domínguez

Centro Atómico Bariloche, 8400 S. C. de Bariloche, Rio Negro, Argentina

Niels Grønbech-Jensen, and A. R. Bishop

Theoretical Division and Center for Nonlinear Studies, MS B262, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM 87545

(February 1, 2008)

Abstract

We study the melting of a moving vortex lattice through numerical simulations with the current driven 3D XY model with disorder. We find that there is a first-order phase transition even for large disorder when the corresponding equilibrium transition is continuous. The low temperature phase is an anisotropic moving glass.

PACS numbers: 74.60.Ge, 74.60.Ec, 74.50+r

There is now growing experimental [1–4] and theoretical [5–11] evidence that the vortex lattice (VL) in clean high T_c superconductors melts via a first order transition. Most of the experiments consist of measurements of jumps in the linear resistance [1–3] and in the equilibrium magnetization [4]. These results are consistent with computer simulations in the 3D XY model [6–10] as well as in other models [11]. However, even in clean samples there is always random weak pinning, which destroys the crystalline order of the VL. Moreover, large disorder can transform the first-order transition into a continuous transition, as found both experimentally [2] and in simulations [9]. Koshelev and Vinokur [12] have proposed that melting from a perfect lattice will only be possible for a rapidly *moving* VL. For driving currents I much larger than the critical current I_c , the VL is depinned and the effect of the random potential in the moving VL is considerably weakened. Recent experiments [13–15] in clean $\text{YBa}_2\text{Cu}_3\text{O}_7$ crystals driven at currents $I \gg I_c$ have indeed shown a melting transition of the moving VL.

On the other hand, Giamarchi and Le Doussal [16] have shown that the perturbation theory of [12] breaks down even at large vortex velocities, because some modes of static disorder are still present in the moving system. Balents and Fisher [17], in the related system of sliding charge density waves, found that the moving phase has only quasi-long range order in 3D. Therefore, questions such as the existence and nature of a solid moving phase and which effects of the static disorder remain once the VL is in motion are currently under active discussion.

In this Letter we study the behavior of a moving VL driven by currents $I \gg I_c$ as a function of temperature and disorder. We perform numerical simulations in a 3D current-driven XY model [8,9]. A distinct advantage of this model with respect to 2D molecular dynamics simulations [18,19], is that, besides the higher dimensionality, the model allows for local fluctuations of the vorticity (i.e. thermally nucleated vortex loops). Here, we find that the moving VL is a solid phase with an anisotropic structure factor, consistent with the theory of [16], which melts via a first-order phase transition.

The 3D XY Hamiltonian,

$$\mathcal{H} = - \sum_{\mathbf{r}, \hat{\mu}} J_{\hat{\mu}} \cos [\Delta_{\hat{\mu}} \theta(\mathbf{r}) - A_{\hat{\mu}}(\mathbf{r})] , \quad (1)$$

results from modeling the macroscopic properties of a superconductor with the thermal fluctuations of the phase θ [6–10]. We consider a network [6] given by $\mathbf{r} = r_1 \hat{s}_1 + r_2 \hat{s}_2 + r_3 \hat{z}$, with $\hat{s}_1 = \hat{x}$, $\hat{s}_2 = -\frac{1}{2}\hat{x} + \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}\hat{y}$, $\hat{s}_3 = \frac{1}{2}\hat{x} + \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}\hat{y}$. The phase difference is $\Delta_{\hat{\mu}} \theta(\mathbf{r}) = \theta(\mathbf{r} + \hat{\mu}) - \theta(\mathbf{r})$. The gauge factor $A_{\hat{\mu}}(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{2\pi}{\Phi_0} \int_{\mathbf{r}}^{\mathbf{r} + \hat{\mu}} \mathbf{A} \cdot d\mathbf{l}$ ($\Phi_0 = h/2e$) depends on the magnetic induction $\mathbf{B} = \nabla \times \mathbf{A} = B \hat{z}$. (We neglect fluctuations in $\mathbf{B}$, valid for $(\Phi_0/B)^{1/2} \ll \lambda$). We have $A_z(r) = 0$ and $\sum_{xy} A_{\hat{\mu}}(\mathbf{r}) = 2\pi f = 2\pi B s^2 \sqrt{3}/4\Phi_0$, with the network discretization $s = |\hat{\mu}|$. We model disorder with a random $J_{\hat{\mu}}$ in the interval $[(1 - \delta/2)J, (1 + \delta/2)J]$ and $\langle J_{\hat{\mu}} \rangle = J(T) = \Phi_0^2 s / 16\pi^3 \lambda^2(T)$ with $\lambda(T)$ the mean-field penetration depth. We consider a field of $f = 1/6$ and a system of size L^3 . This model was studied in Ref. [6], where it was shown that the VL melting transition is first order. It also has a simultaneous loss of superconducting coherence both in the xy planes and the z direction [8], as seen experimentally in $\text{YBa}_2\text{Cu}_3\text{O}_7$ [3].

The current $I_{\hat{\mu}}(\mathbf{r})$ in each bond of the network is [8]

$$I_{\hat{\mu}}(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{\Phi_0}{2\pi R_N} \frac{d\Delta_{\hat{\mu}} \theta(\mathbf{r})}{dt} + I_{0,\hat{\mu}} \sin [\Delta_{\hat{\mu}} \theta(\mathbf{r}) - A_{\hat{\mu}}(\mathbf{r})] + \eta_{\hat{\mu}}(\mathbf{r}, t) \quad (2)$$

with $I_{0,\hat{\mu}} = 2\pi J_{\hat{\mu}}/\Phi_0$, and R_N the shunt resistance. The thermal noise term is taken to have correlations $\langle \eta_{\hat{\mu}}(\mathbf{r}, t) \eta_{\hat{\mu}'}(\mathbf{r}', t') \rangle = (2k_B T / R_N) \delta_{\hat{\mu}, \hat{\mu}'} \delta_{\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}'} \delta(t - t')$. Together with the condition of current conservation,

$$\sum_{\hat{\mu}} [I_{\hat{\mu}}(\mathbf{r}) - I_{\hat{\mu}}(\mathbf{r} - \hat{\mu})] = \Delta_{\hat{\mu}} \cdot I_{\hat{\mu}}(\mathbf{r}) = I_{ext}(\mathbf{r}), \quad (3)$$

this determines the full set of dynamical equations. The boundary conditions are periodic along the $\hat{x}$ ($\hat{s}_1$) and $\hat{z}$ directions, and open in the $\hat{s}_2$ direction, with a current bias I corresponding to $I_{ext}(\mathbf{r}) = I(\delta_{r_2,0} - \delta_{r_2,L})$. We simulate this set of equations with the same numerical methods and integration parameters as in Ref. [8].

We calculate the normalized voltage drop along the direction of the current as $v = \frac{\mathcal{U}}{L^3} \sum_{r_1, r_3} \langle \dot{\theta}(r_1, L, r_3) - \dot{\theta}(r_1, 0, r_3) \rangle$. In Fig. 1(a) we show the dc resistance $R = v/i$ for a high current $i = 0.2$ (currents are normalized by $\langle I_{0,\hat{\mu}} \rangle$) as a function of increasing and decreasing

temperature, for systems with disorder $\delta = 0.01, 0.1, 0.8$. The driving current is well above the critical current $i_c(T = 0) \approx 0.04$, so the moving lattice is depinned. The local vorticity along the direction $\hat{\nu}$ is given by $n_{\hat{\nu}}(\mathbf{R}, t) = -\sum_{\text{plaquette}} \text{nint}[(\Delta_{\hat{\mu}}\theta(\mathbf{r}) - A_{\hat{\mu}}(\mathbf{r}))/2\pi]$ for $\hat{\nu} \perp \hat{\mu}$; with $\text{nint}[x]$ the nearest integer to x . Vorticity is conserved both locally: $\Delta_{\mu} \cdot n_{\hat{\mu}}(\mathbf{R}) = 0$, and globally: $\langle n_z(R, t) \rangle = f$, $\langle n_{\hat{s}_i}(R, t) \rangle = 0$. In order to study vortex lattice melting, we calculate the vortex structure function: $S(\mathbf{k}) = \frac{1}{L^3} \sum_{r_3} \langle n_z(\mathbf{k}, r_3) n_z(-\mathbf{k}, r_3) \rangle$. In Fig.1(b) we show the intensity of one of the Bragg peaks of the VL, $S_G = S(\mathbf{G}_1)$, with $\mathbf{G}_1 = (\frac{2\pi}{3}, \frac{2\pi}{\sqrt{3}})$ as a function of T for $\delta = 0.01, 0.1, 0.8$. Besides the field-induced vortex lines, it is also possible to have thermally induced vortex loops. Therefore, we calculate the average number of extra vortices along the z direction, $n_z = \langle |n_z(R, t)| \rangle - f$, and the average vortex excitations in the xy directions $n_{xy} = \langle |n_{xy}(R, t)| \rangle$. This is shown in Fig.1(c) as a function of T for $\delta = 0.1$ only.

The results of Fig.1(b) show that the moving VL has a first-order melting transition where S_G vanishes with a sudden drop of nearly two orders of magnitude at a melting temperature T_M^I . We also see hysteresis when increasing and decreasing T . We find that for weak disorder $\delta < \delta_c \sim 0.5$ the melting transition does not show any significant variation with disorder (in Fig.1(b) the results for $\delta = 0.01$ and $\delta = 0.1$ are very similar). This means that the effect of random pinning in the moving VL is negligible for small disorder. For $\delta > \delta_c$, T_M^I shifts to lower temperatures and the hysteresis loop slightly increases (shown for $\delta = 0.8$ in Fig.1). A finite size study of the transition is shown in Fig. 2 for $\delta = 0.1$, for system sizes $L = 12, 18, 24$ [20]. We see that for $L = 12$, S_G vs. T shows a broad transition with little hysteresis. After increasing the system size, there is a clear hysteretic jump in S_G , which becomes sharper when going from $L = 18$ to $L = 24$, suggesting that there is a first-order transition in the thermodynamic limit. The melting temperature T_M^I slightly decreases when going from $L = 18$ to $L = 24$, meaning that the asymptotic behavior has not been reached yet. (However, the difference is close to the temperature resolution of this Langevin simulation, $\Delta T \approx 0.01$). We also find that the superconducting coherence along the z direction vanishes simultaneously with the melting transition, from the calculation of

the helicity modulus Υ_z (not shown here), similar to what we found in equilibrium for $\delta = 0$ [8].

The experiments of Ref. [13,14] consisted of measurements of voltage and differential resistance for the VL driven at $I \gg I_c$. A small dip in the differential resistance was observed at temperatures close to but below the equilibrium T_M . In Fig.1(a) we see that the dc voltage for $T < T_M^I$ is approximately constant; it has a small dip at T_M^I and then rises with temperature for $T > T_M^I$. The dip in the voltage is very small for weak disorder (within the statistical error), and increases with disorder, being very noticeable for $\delta > \delta_c$. The voltage dip is usually associated with a peak effect in the critical current happening right below melting [13,14]. From our simulation results, we see that this is only a weak evidence for a melting transition. Recent magnetization measurements done by Fendrich *et al* [15] give a better signature of the melting of the moving VL.

It is interesting to study the behavior of thermally excited vortices. In Fig.1(c) we show the number of vortex excitations in the directions parallel to the field, n_z , parallel to the current, n_y , and perpendicular to both the field and the current, n_x . We see that all of them increase with T (at low T it is a thermally activated process $n_\nu \sim \exp(-U_\nu/T)$), and they have a sudden jump and hysteresis at T_M^I . We also find that $n_x > n_y \gg n_z$ for all T . When compared with their values in equilibrium we find that $n_x(I) > n_x(0)$, $n_y(I) < n_y(0)$ and $n_z(I) > n_z(0)$ (near equilibrium $n_x(0) = n_y(0) \gg n_z(0)$). This means that the effect of the drive is to orient the vortex loops in the plane perpendicular to the current, and to increase the average size of the loops. Also the relative fraction of vortex excitations in the field direction $n_z/(n_x + n_y)$ increases with I , thus increasing the entropy of the moving phase. These effects tend to lower the temperature for loop unbinding with respect to the melting and unbinding temperature T_M^0 of the static VL.

Let us now analyze the structure of the moving VL. Surface plots of $S(\mathbf{k})$ are shown in Figs.3(a-b) for temperatures below and above T_M^I . We find that below T_M^I there are Bragg peaks which suddenly disappear at T_M^I . The Bragg peak structure of the low temperature moving phase is very anisotropic as can be seen in Fig.3(a). There are two possible non-

degenerate orientations of the VL relative to the external current. In the 2D simulations of Moon *et al.* [18] the VL is oriented with one of the reciprocal lattice vectors perpendicular to the driving Lorentz force, while here one is parallel to it. This orientation is favored here because of the network discretization relative to the direction of the applied current. (In the other orientation the VL is frustrated.) In Fig.3(a) we see that the Bragg peak with reciprocal lattice vector $\mathbf{G}_0 = \pm(\frac{4\pi}{3}, 0)$, parallel to the direction of motion, is considerably smaller than the peaks at $\mathbf{G}_1 = \pm(\frac{2\pi}{3}, \frac{2\pi}{\sqrt{3}})$ and $\mathbf{G}_2 = \pm(-\frac{2\pi}{3}, \frac{2\pi}{\sqrt{3}})$. A similar result was found in [18] for the peaks with components parallel to the direction of motion. However, when increasing system sizes, we do not see here any significant decrease on the height of the $\mathbf{G}_0$ peak, as reported in [18]. In Fig.3(c-d) we analyze in detail the finite size scaling behavior of the peak at $\mathbf{G}_2$. The peak is very anisotropic: it has a finite width in the direction perpendicular to vortex motion [Fig.3(c)] whereas it has almost zero width in the direction parallel to vortex motion [Fig.3(d)]. In Fig.3(c) we show a finite size scaling analysis of the peak width along the y direction : $S(\delta k_y, L) \sim L^{2-\nu} F(\delta k_y L)$ for $L = 12, 18, 24$, with $\delta k_y = k_y - G_{2y}$. Due to the discreteness of the network there are few points to consider, and the scaling results are not very precise. We obtain $\nu \sim 0.15 \pm 0.1$. We find a similar result for the other peaks, both for $\mathbf{G}_1$ and for $\mathbf{G}_0$, but with a greater inaccuracy in the latter case. Despite the large uncertainty, from our results we can be sure that $\nu < 0.3$. In the 2D simulations of [18] an exponent of $\nu_{2D} \approx 0.53$ was obtained, with seemingly isotropic Bragg peaks. The anisotropic peaks found here are more consistent with the discussion of Giamarchi and Le Doussal in [16], where it was shown that the effects of the static disorder are still relevant in the direction transverse to vortex motion. The fact that in our case the low temperature moving phase seems more “ordered” (i.e. smaller ν) can be due to: (a) three-dimensionality; (b) the long-range (logarithmic) interactions between vortices. In any case, our results are consistent with the recent experiment of Fendrich *et al.* [15] where a large external drive does not affect the first-order character of the melting transition, indicating that there is a low temperature moving solid.

We have made a systematic comparison of our results for the moving VL ($I \gg I_c$)

with simulations near equilibrium ($I \ll I_c$) for different values of δ . The main result is summarized in the phase diagram shown in Fig.4. We see that for increasing disorder the equilibrium first-order transition turns into a continuous transition or a crossover for $\delta \gtrsim 0.5$, in agreement with the results of Jagla and Balseiro [9]. On the contrary, the phase transition of the moving VL *is always of first-order character*, the only effect of large disorder $\delta \gtrsim 0.5$ is in lowering T_M^I . Also we find that $T_M^I < T_M^0$ for any value of the disorder. This is due to the coincidence of melting with vortex loop unbinding: since the bias current tends to unbind loops more easily, T_M^I should be lower than T_M^0 , as we discussed above. Also at zero field, where the phase transition is driven by vortex loop unbinding, a bias current considerably lowers the critical temperature [21]. Recently, it has been suggested by Nguyen *et al.* [10] that the presence of vortex loops in the melting transition could explain the anomalous behavior of the entropy jump found by Zeldov *et al.* [4]. From our results, Fig.4, we believe that a measurement of a finite $\Delta T_M = T_M^0 - T_M^I$ could be an experimental probe of the role of vortex loops in the melting transition. Also a “shaking temperature” effect could give $T_M^I < T_M^0$ [12]. However, this gives a ΔT_M which depends on disorder, and should vanish for $\delta \rightarrow 0$. In the experiment of Safar *et al.* [13], with a field $B \parallel c$, a dip in the differential resistance was observed very close to, but below, the equilibrium melting transition. The experiment of Fendrich *et al.* [15] does not show a reasonable dependence of T_M with the bias current. This can be due to: (a) the ΔT_M is too small to be discernible within experimental resolution, or (b) the bias current of [15] is not high enough (here, the current is such that the VL is in a flux flow state at $T = 0$, whereas in [15] there is no dissipation at low T). In the experiment of D’Anna *et al.* [14], with $B \parallel ab$ a dip in the differential resistance appears clearly below the equilibrium T_M . Since it is easier to have thermal nucleation of loops parallel to the ab planes, this could lead to a measurable ΔT_M for $B \parallel ab$.

In conclusion, we find that the low temperature moving phase is an anisotropic glass which melts via a first-order transition in 3D, even for large values of disorder. Our results stress the three-dimensionality of the VL: there is a more “ordered” moving phase when compared with 2D simulations [18], and at melting there is a simultaneous loss of

superconducting coherence along the z axis.

D. D. acknowledges discussions with H. Safar. This work was supported by the U.S.D.O.E..

REFERENCES

- [1] H. Safar *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **69**, 824 (1992). W. K. Kwok *et al.*, *ibid.* **69**, 3370 (1992); M. Charalambous *et al.*, *ibid.* **71**, 436 (1993); W. K. Kwok *et al.*, *ibid.* **72**, 1092 (1994).
- [2] H. Safar *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 3800 (1993); W. K. Kwok *et al.*, *ibid.* **72**, 1088 (1994); J. A. Fendrich *et al.*, *ibid.* **74**, 1210 (1995).
- [3] D. López *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett., **76**, 4034 (1996).
- [4] H. Pastoriza *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **72**, 2951 (1994); E. Zeldov *et al.*, Nature (London) **375**, 373 (1995); U. Welp *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 4809 (1996); D. T. Fuchs *et al.*, Phys. Rev. B **54**, R796 (1996).
- [5] G. Blatter *et al.*, Rev. Mod. Phys. **66**, 1125 (1994).
- [6] R. E. Hetzel *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **69**, 518 (1992).
- [7] Y. H. Li and S. Teitel, Phys. Rev. B **47**, 359 (1993), *ibid.* **49**, 4136 (1994); T. Chen and S. Teitel, Phys. Rev. Lett. **74**, 2792 (1995); G. Carneiro, *ibid.* **75**, 521 (1995).
- [8] D. Domínguez, N. Grønbech-Jensen and A.R. Bishop, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 4670 (1995).
- [9] E. A. Jagla and C. A. Balseiro, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 1588 (1996); and preprint.
- [10] A. K. Nguyen *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 1592 (1996).
- [11] S. Ryu *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **68**, 710 (1992); R. Šášik and D. Stroud, Phys. Rev. Lett. **72**, 2462 (1994); S. Doniach *et al.*, J. Low Temp. Phys. **95**, 353 (1994); S. Ryu and D. Stroud, Phys. Rev. B **54**, 1320 (1996).
- [12] A. E. Koshelev and V. M. Vinokur, Phys. Rev. Lett. **73**, 3580 (1994).
- [13] H. Safar *et al.*, Phys. Rev. B **52**, 6211 (1995)
- [14] G. D'Anna *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 3251 (1995).
- [15] J. A. Fendrich *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 2073 (1996).

- [16] T. Giamarchi and P. Le Doussal, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 3408 (1996).
- [17] L. Balents and M. P. A. Fisher, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 4270 (1995).
- [18] K. Moon *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 2778 (1996).
- [19] S. Ryu *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 5114 (1996).
- [20] For $L \neq 18$, the periodic boundary condition is $\theta(\mathbf{r} + L\hat{x}) = \theta(\mathbf{r}) + \pi L/9$, to avoid frustration of the $\delta = 0$ ground state [6].
- [21] N. Grønbech-Jensen, D. Domínguez and A.R. Bishop, Physica B **222**, 396 (1996).

FIGURES

FIG. 1. (a) DC voltage over current $R = v/i$ as a function of temperature T for a bias current $i = 0.2 \gg i_c$ and $L = 18$. Dotted line: $\delta = 0.01$, triangles: $\delta = 0.1$; squares: $\delta = 0.8$. The melting temperatures in equilibrium, T_M^0 , and for the driven system, T_M^I , are indicated. (b) Intensity of the Bragg peak S_G vs. T . (c) Plot of the density of thermally excited vortices n_ν vs. T , for $\delta = 0.1$.

FIG. 2. Plot of the intensity of the Bragg peak S_G vs. T for $\delta = 0.1$ and different system sizes.

FIG. 3. Surface plots of the structure factor $S(\mathbf{k})$ for $\delta = 0.1$, current $i = 0.2$ and $L = 18$. For (a) $T = 1.0$, (b) $T = 1.2$. (c) Finite size scaling plot of the k -dependence of the Bragg peak in the direction transverse to vortex motion. (d) Same as (c) but in the direction parallel to vortex motion. Results for $\delta = 0.1$ and $T = 0.9$.

FIG. 4. Disorder-temperature phase diagram. Triangles: equilibrium transition temperature T_M^0 . Squares: transition temperature of the driven system T_M^I . Continuous lines: first-order transitions. Dashed line: continuous transition. Dotted lines: limit of the hysteresis loops for a given cooling rate. Results for $L = 18$.







